

Raymond Mashni, Treasurer
"Friends of Andrew Concannon
aka [sic] Concannon for Congress"
P.O. Box 6958
Saginaw, MI 48608

DCT 2 4 2008

RE: MUR 6004

Friends of Andrew Concannon

Andrew Concannon

"Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" (f/k/a

Concannon for Congress) and Raymond Mashni, in his official

capacity as treasurer

Dear Mr. Mashni:

On May 7, 2008, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint was forwarded to you at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, and information supplied by you, the Commission, on October 1, 2008, found that there was no reason to believe that Friends of Andrew Concannon violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 433, 434, 441a, 441b, 441c and 441e, provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. The Commission also found there is no reason to believe that Andrew Concannon violated 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e) and 11 C.F.R. § 300.61.

The Commission, on the same date, also voted to dismiss as a matter of prosecutorial discretion and issue an admonishment to "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" (f/k/a Concannon for Congress) and Raymond Mashni, in his official capacity as treasurer, ("the Committee"), in connection with violations of 2 U.S.C. §§ 433, 434(b), and 441d, and closed the file in this matter. The Commission admonishes the Committee for apparent violations of: (1) 2 U.S.C. § 433 caused by not timely amending its Statement of Organization to correct the erroneous identification of Friends of Andrew Concannon as an affiliated committee; (2) 2 U.S.C. § 434(b) caused by failing to disclose a \$350 in-kind contribution of digital signs from Dave's Sign Rental; and (3) 2 U.S.C. § 441d caused by improperly identifying "Friends of Andrew of Concannon," an entity not registered as an authorized committee, on campaign communications as the entity paying for the communications. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

The Committee should amend the appropriate disclosure report to disclose the in-kind contribution resulting from the donation of digital signs.

The Committee's current name, as listed on its May 30, 2008, amendment to its Statement of Organization, is "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka Concannon for Congress," but the Committee appears to be using Concannon for Congress and Friends of Andrew Concannon interchangeably. The Committee must use its complete name, as the name appears on its current Statement of Organization, on all required disclaimers for communications paid for by the Committee. The Committee may amend its Statement of Organization to change its name, but it then must use whatever name is listed on its most recent Statement of Organization on all required disclaimers for all communications paid for by the Committee.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70.426 (Dec. 18, 2003).

If you have any questions, please contact Dominique Dillenseger, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Audra L. Wassom

Acting Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure

Factual and Legal Analysis

1	FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION							
2 3	FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS							
4 5 6 7 8 9	RESPONDENTS: Andrew Concannon MUR: 6004 .  Friends of Andrew Concannon  "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic]  Concannon for Congress" (f/k/a Concannon for Congress)  and Raymond Mashni, in his official capacity as treasurer							
10 11 12 13	I. GENERATION OF MATTER  This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by							
14	the Michigan Republican Party. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1).							
15 16 17	II. <u>FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS</u> The complaint in this matter contains three general allegations: (1) Friends of Andrew							
18	Concannon ("FAC"), a Section 527 organization, violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of							
19	1971, as amended, ("the Act") by receiving contributions and making expenditures in connection							
20	with a Federal election without registering and reporting as a political committee; (2) that FAC							
21	may be raising funds from prohibited sources or accepting excessive contributions, and that							
22	Andrew Concannon, the candidate, is raising funds for FAC in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441i and							
23	11 C.F.R. § 300.61 (funds not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements							
24	of the Act); and (3) that Concannon For Congress ("CPC"), Mr. Concannon's principal							
25	campaign committee, may have failed to properly disclose all disbursements in connection with a							
26	St. Patrick's Day event and may have received prohibited in-kind contributions from FAC in							
27	connection with this event.							
28	Finally, while not specifically alleged in the complaint, Respondents improperly listed							
29	FAC on CPC's disclosure forms and campaign communications. As discussed further below, the							
30	available information indicates that after Mr. Concannon became a Federal candidate, he							

MUR 6004 ("Priends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.) **Factual and Legal Analysis** Page 2 of 12

n i	egistered his	principal can	paign committee	under the name "	Concannon for	Congress"	but used
-----	---------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	----------

- the name "Friends of Andrew Concannon," the name of the Section 527 organization that 2
- engaged in exploratory activities, as if it were an authorized committee of CFC. It appears that 3
- the committee might be using the FAC and CFC names interchangeably. 1

## Alleged Failure to Register FAC as a Political Committee and File FEC A. **Disclosure Reports**

6 7 8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

5

The complaint alleges that FAC, a Section 527 entity not registered with the FEC. received contributions and made expenditures in connection with a Federal election without registering and reporting as a political committee.

11 In support of its allegations, the complaint provides a copy of Internal Revenue Service Form 8871 ("Political Organization Notice of Section 527 Status"), which shows that Mr. Concannon established an entity called "Friends of Andrew Concannon" in late November 2007. and filed the Notice of Status with the IRS on January 22, 2008.<sup>2</sup> Complaint at Exhibit 1. The complaint states that FAC is not registered as a political committee with the FEC or with any other election authority, but points out that the Notice of Section 527 Status contains the 16

"Campaign and fundraising committee/association organized for accepting donations and making expenditures for the purpose of electing Andrew Concannon to public office - an exempt function under law."

Id. at 1.

following statement of purpose:

The committee's most recent disclosure report, the 2008 Pre-Primary Report, filed on July 24, 2008, and covering the period April 1, 2008 through July 16, 2008, lists "Concannon for Congress" as the committee name, approximately two months after the committee changed its name on its Statement of Organization to "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress."

The Form 8871 that FAC filed with the IRS to register as a Section 527 organization indicates that FAC was established on November 29, 2007. However, the Form \$871 was not actually signed by Andrew Concannon until January 22, 2008. The Commission does not know why the Form 8871 was not signed until January 22nd.

21

MUR 6004 ("Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 3 of 12

In reply, Respondents assert that they did not violate the Act and the Commission's 1 2 regulations, explaining that FAC was the precursor organization to CFC and was formed during the exploratory phase to determine whether Mr. Concannon's candidacy was viable. 3 Respondents further assert that Mr. Concannon filed the Notice of Section 527 Status so that 4 FAC would be tax-exempt during the exploratory period. Respondents assert that FAC only 5 6 raised and spent permissible funds during the exploratory period, which were properly disclosed in CFC's first disclosure report, the 2008 April Quarterly Report.<sup>3</sup> 7 Under the Act, an individual becomes a candidate for Federal office (and thus triggers 8 9 registration and reporting obligations under the Act) when his or her campaign either receives 10 \$5,000 in contributions or makes \$5,000 in expenditures. 2 U.S.C. § 431(2). There is, however, a limited exception for amounts raised and spent while an individual is "testing the waters" in 11 12 order to decide whether to become a candidate. In such cases, the Commission's regulations provide that the terms "contribution" and "expenditure" do not include funds received or 13 payments made solely to determine whether an individual should become a candidate. 11 C.F.R. 14 §§ 100.72(a) and 100.131(a). Thus, before making a final decision as to whether to become a 15 candidate, an individual may raise or spend more than \$5,000 without triggering candidate status 16 if his or her activities are permissible "testing the waters" activities, which include, but are not 17 18 limited to, conducting polls, making telephone calls, and travel. Id. Only funds permissible 19 under the Act may be used for such activities. Id.

However, when an individual raises or spends more than \$5,000 and engages in activities indicating that he or she has decided to run for a particular office, or activities relevant to

After its registration as a principal campaign committee, CFC filed its first disclosure report, the 2006 April Quarterly Report. The report disclosed receipts totaling \$27,866.70 and disbursements totaling \$11,643.14, including itemized receipts of \$3,447.64 and disbursements of \$1,773.64 during the exploratory period.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

MUR 6004 ("Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 4 of 12

Page 4 of 12 conducting a campaign, the individual is deemed to have crossed the line from "testing the 1 waters" to "candidate" status under the Act. These activities include, but are not limited to: 2 using general public political advertising to publicize the individual's intention to campaign for 3 Federal office; raising funds in excess of what could reasonably be expected to be used for exploratory activities or activities designed to amass funds to be spent after becoming a 5 candidate: making or authorizing written or oral statements that refer to the individual as a 6 candidate for a particular office; or conducting activities in close proximity to the election or 7 over a protracted period of time. 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.72(b) and 100.131(b). 8 Based on the information provided by Respondents and in disclosure reports, it appears 9 that Concannon established FAC as his "exploratory committee" while testing the waters to 10 11 12

that Concannon established FAC as his "exploratory committee" while testing the waters to determine the viability of his candidacy. First, the name "Friends of Andrew Concannon" does not refer to Concannon as a candidate for a particular office. Second, the statement of purpose on the Section 527 application is ambiguous regarding whether Concannon had in fact made a decision to run for Federal office. In any event, even if the statement could be construed as a statement of his intent to run for office, the amount of money raised or spent by Mr. Concannon during the exploratory phase was below the \$5,000 threshold for triggering candidate status. See n.3, supra.

Therefore, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Friends of Andrew Concannon violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 433 and 434 by failing to register and report as a political committee.

B. Alleged Impermissible Fundraising By Andrew Concannon for FAC and Fundraising By FAC

According to the complaint, Andrew Concannon, a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives for Michigan's 4th Congressional District, raised funds for FAC in amounts and

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MUR 6004 ("Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 5 of 12

from sources prohibited under the Act. Complaint at 2-3. The complaint also alleges that FAC
may have raised funds on its own that do not meet the requirements of the Act.

The Act, as amended, prohibits Federal candidates and officeholders, any "agent of a 3 candidate or an individual holding Federal office," or any entity established, financed, 4 maintained or controlled by a Federal candidate from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring 5 or spending funds in connection with an election for Federal office, including funds for Federal 6 election activity, or in connection with any election other than an election for Federal office, 7 unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions and reporting requirements of the Act. 8 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)(1). The available information indicates that FAC and Mr. Concannon raised 9 funds for Mr. Concannon's Federal campaign within the limits of the Act. Respondents state 10 that all of the funds raised by and for FAC were disclosed by CPC in its first disclosure report. 11 Response at 2. The Commission has no information to suggest otherwise, and the contributions 12 disclosed in CFC's 2008 April Quarterly Report appear to be within applicable limits and from 13 permissible sources. Therefore, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Andrew 14 Concannon violated 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e) and 11 C.F.R. § 300.61 in connection with these 15 activities. For the same reasons, the Commission finds no reason to believe that FAC violated 16 17 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a, 441b, 441c, and 441e in connection with these activities.

C. Alleged Nondisclosure of In-kind Contributions and Expenditures for St. Patrick's Day Event

The complaint alleges that the amount CFC disclosed for parade supplies (\$224.87) on its 2008 April Quarterly Report must be far less than what it actually spent, and that FAC, the unregistered committee, must have paid for the supplies as prohibited in-kind contributions. In their response, Respondents stated that they reported all expenses for the event and provided invoices for the expenses, which total \$626.87: T-shirts (\$162.18); printing of signs and banners

MUR 6004 ("Priends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.) Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 6 of 12

- (\$402.00); and candy (\$62.69). All of these expenses were reported on CFC's 2008 April
- 2 Quarterly Report. See Response at Exhibits A-C. Because, as further discussed below (Section
- 3 D), it appears that FAC became CFC and the two are actually one in the same committee, it does
- 4 not appear that CPC accepted prohibited in-kind contributions from FAC.
- 5 Respondents also indicate that two digital signs bearing Mr. Concannon's image were on
- 6 display at the St. Patrick's Day event. Id. at 2. Respondents assert that the digital signs were
- 7 provided by two individuals (owners of the sign business called "Dave's Sign Rental") "as a
- 8 voluntary expression of support" and that these individuals "did not intend to make a donation."
- 9 Respondents note that they determined the cost of the sign usage and accessories to be \$350 and
- that if the Commission considers these signs to be an in-kind contribution, they will amend their
- 11 April Quarterly Report to disclose the contribution. Respondents further note that any such
- contribution from Dave's Sign Rental would be permissible because Dave's Sign Rental is not
- 13 organized as a corporation. A Dun and Bradstreet search does not reveal any information that
- would indicate that Dave's Sign Rental is incorporated. Therefore, any contribution from Dave's
- 15 Sign Rental to CFC would be permissible within the Act's contribution limits, but would need to
- be disclosed by the committee in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 434(b).
- 17 Respondents note that a truck and trailer were used to haul and position the signs, but did
- 18 not specifically state that Dave's Sign Rental paid for or provided the truck and trailer. A photo
- of the truck and trailer provided with the complaint shows what appear to be the campaign's own
- 20 signs on the truck attached to the trailer with the digital signs provided by Dave's Sign Rental.
- 21 See Complaint at Exhibit 6. Thus, it appears that the campaign itself may have provided the
- 22 truck and trailer to haul the digital signs provided by Dave's Sign Rental, which would indicate

MUR 6004 ("Priends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 7 of 12

- 1 knowledge by the campaign that the digital signs were going to be provided and participation in
- 2 the set-up of the signs with Dave's Sign Rental.
- 3 A contribution is anything of value given, loaned or advanced to influence a federal
- election. See 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i); see also 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(a). Commission regulations
- 5 define "anything of value" to include "the provision of any goods or services without charge or
- at a charge that is less than the usual and normal charge for such goods or services." 11 C.F.R.
- 7 § 100.52(d)(1). Thus, the donation of the digital signs without charge appears to constitute an in-
- 8 kind contribution from Dave's Sign Rental to Respondents. An in-kind contribution is treated as
- both a "contribution" to and an "expenditure" by the political committee receiving the in-kind
- contribution. 11 C.F.R §§ 100.111(e); 104.13(a)(2). An authorized committee of a candidate must
- report and itemize all contributions received from individuals that aggregate in excess of \$200 per
- election cycle. 2 U.S.C. § 434(b); 11 C.F.R. § 104.3(a)(4). An in-kind contribution must also be
- reported as an expenditure on the same report. 11 C.P.R. §§ 104.3(b) and 104.13(a)(2). As such,
- \$350.00 should have been disclosed as both a contribution to and an expenditure by Respondents
- in their 2008 April Quarterly Report.
- Based on Respondents' response to the complaint and disclosure reports, it appears that
- 17 Respondents properly disclosed all contributions and expenditures associated with the St.
- 18 Patrick's Day event, except for the in-kind contribution from Dave's Sign Rental. Thus, it
- 19 appears that Respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(b) by failing to disclose an in-kind
- 20 contribution. Because the failure to disclose the in-kind contribution was de minimis, the
- 21 Commission has determined to dismiss with admonishment.

MUR 6004 ("Priends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 8 of 12

D. Apparent Failure of Respondents to Properly Register the Name of the Principal Campaign Committee and Include the Appropriate Disclaimer on 2 Communications 3 The complaint states that the Concannon's campaign Statement of Organization identifies 4 FAC as an "affiliated committee" of CFC, even though FAC is not registered with the FEC, and 5 that various Concannon campaign communications and correspondence contain a statement that 6 FAC paid for the communication. The complaint provides the following documents: (1) a copy 7 of a campaign brochure produced by the Concannon campaign with the statement: "Paid for by 8 Priends of Andrew Concannon"; (2) a page from the official website for Concannon for 9 Congress which states "Powered by Friends of Andrew Concannon"; and, (3) copy of an April 2, 10 2008, letter from Concannon for Congress to the FBC on stationery containing the statement: 11 "Paid for by Friends of Andrew Concannon." Complaint at Exhibits 1-5. 12 Achieving "candidate" status triggers registration and reporting requirements for the 13 candidate and for his principal campaign committee. Within 15 days of becoming a candidate. 14 the individual must file a Statement of Candidacy with the Commission that designates the 15 candidate's principal campaign committee. 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1); see also 11 C.F.R. § 101.1(a). 16 17 The principal campaign committee must file a Statement of Organization no later than ten days after it has been designated by the candidate. 2 U.S.C. § 433(a). 18 19 The candidate may designate the exploratory committee as the principal campaign committee and change the name of the committee as appropriate. The candidate may also 20 designate additional political committees to serve as authorized committees of the candidate that 21 may accept contributions or make expenditures on behalf of the candidate by filing a designation 22 with the principal campaign committee. See 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1); 11 C.F.R. §§ 101.1(b) and 23 24 102,13(a)(1). However, within 10 days after being designated by the candidate, the authorized

MUR 6004 ("Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 9 of 12

- committee must file its own registration statement (FBC Form 1, Statement of Organization) and
- 2 disclosure reports. See 2 U.S.C. §§ 433 and 434(b); 11 C.F.R. §§ 102.1(b) and 102.13(a)(1).
- 3 Any amendment to the Statement of Organization must be filed within 10 days of the date of the
- 4 change or correction. Id.
- 5 On January 23, 2008, Mr. Concannon filed his Statement of Candidacy designating
- 6 "Concannon for Congress" as the principal campaign committee and "Friends of Andrew
- 7 Concannon" as an "authorized committee." On January 28, 2008, the treasurer for CFC filed a
- 8 Statement of Organization (FBC Form 1) registering CFC as the principal campaign committee
- 9 and identifying FAC as an "affiliated committee." After receiving notice of the complaint, CPC
- 10 filed an amended Statement of Organization on June 2, 2008, deleting the identification of FAC
- as an "affiliated committee" and changing the name of the principal campaign committee to
- 12 "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress."
- In their response, Respondents clarify that FAC was a "precursor committee" to CFC and
- 14 that it was identified on CFC's Statement of Organization to disclose its existence and to register
- 15 FAC under the name CFC. Response at 2. Respondents further state that FAC and CFC "are
- one in the same committee." Id. The response did not explain why the campaign has identified
- 17 FAC as the entity financing the campaign's communications.
- 18 As already explained, Mr. Concannon apparently designated FAC as an "authorized
- 19 committee" on his Statement of Candidacy and as an "affiliated committee" on CPC's Statement
- 20 of Organization merely to disclose the existence of FAC as the precursor organization to CFC
- 21 and to register FAC under the name CFC. However, as a designated "authorized committee,"
- 22 FAC never filed a Statement of Organization as required under the Act and regulations and did

All authorized committees of the same candidate for the same election to Pederal office are affiliated. 11 C.F.R. § 100.5(g)(1).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MUR 6004 ("Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 10 of 12

not file any disclosure reports. It also appears that Respondents erroneously identified FAC as an affiliated committee on the Statement of Organization. When Respondents later amended their Statement Organization to change the committee name to "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress," they deleted the reference to FAC as an affiliated committee. However, the amendment deleting the reference to PAC as an affiliated committee was filed more than 4 months after the original Statement of Organization, in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 433. It also appears that Respondents erroneously listed FAC on campaign communications as the entity paying for the communications. The response does not address why Respondents did so, but the available information, including Respondents' use of two names on its amended Statement of Organization and its continued use of both names on campaign communications, suggests that Respondents believe that the Committee may use more than one official name. A campaign that authorizes and finances any communication must include a disclaimer notice, which states that the communication was paid for by the authorized committee. 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a). Communications requiring a disclaimer include those made through any broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility; mass mailing (more than 500 substantially similar mailings within 30 days), telephone bank (more than 500 substantially similar calls within 30 days), or any other form of general public political advertising. 11 C.F.R. § 100.26, 100.27, 100.28. Electronic mail of more than 500 substantially similar communications when sent by a political committee, and all Internet websites of political committees available to the general public must also include disclaimers. 11 C.F.R. § 110.11. The CPC identified FAC as the entity paying for the communication in disclaimers on at

least one campaign brochure, a letter sent to the FEC on campaign stationery, and on its official

MUR 6004 ("Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Pactual and Legal Analysis
Page 11 of 12

ı campaign website. Complaint at Exhibits 1-5. The Commission does not have information on how the campaign brochure was disseminated or how the campaign stationery was used, but the 2 available information suggests that CFC may have used the same disclaimer on all of its 3 campaign communications. Because FAC was not a registered authorized committee of CFC. 4 CPC's use of FAC in its disclaimers on a CPC campaign brochure, on the campaign's official 5 6 website, and on campaign stationery, as if it were an authorized committee would appear to be a violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441d. 7 The amended Statement of Organization also changed the name of the principal 8 campaign committee from one name, Concannon for Congress, to a combination of two names. 9 "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress," and the committee appears 10 to be using the CPC and FAC names interchangeably. However, the use of more than one 11 official name for the principal campaign committee does not appear to be authorized by the Act 12 or the Commission's regulations, which only contemplate one principal campaign committee. 13 See 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1) and (4); 11 C.F.R. §§ 101.1 and 102.14(a). 14 Based on the above, it appears that "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon 15 for Congress" and Raymond Mashni, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. 16 17 § 433, by untimely amending its Statement of Organization to delete FAC as an "affiliated 18 committee" of CPC, and 2 U.S.C. § 441d, by identifying FAC, an entity not registered as an authorized committee, on its campaign communications as the entity paying for the 19 communications. 20 These violations appear to have arisen from a misunderstanding as to the reporting and 21 naming requirements of the Act. The Commission has no information to suggest that the 22

communications containing the improper disclaimers, other than the website, were widely

MUR 6004 ("Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" et al.)
Pactual and Legal Analysis
Page 12 of 12

- distributed or that the campaign's use of two names caused widespread confusion. Therefore, in
- 2 the interest of conserving Commission resources, the Commission is exercising its prosecutorial
- discretion to dismiss the matter in connection with these violations, issue an admonishment, and
- 4 close the file. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).